

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-8 have been rejected. Claim 1 is amended by this Amendment. Support for this Amendment is found generally throughout the specification and specifically on page 4, line 4. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-8 remain pending in the present application.

INTERVIEW

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner Liu for the phone interview of January 12, 2009. We appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Examiner in the interview. The claims have been amended in light of the points made by the Examiner in the interview.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subjection matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite “preconfigured policy” instead of “preconceived policy”. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cochran et al. (Publication No. U.S. 2002/0161867 A1)

Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the rejection. Amended Claim 1 recites: A method for automatically configuring devices in a network, comprising the method associating preconfigured defined policy settings with physical locations in the network, the preconfigured policy settings associated with each physical location in the network being usable to configure network devices at the physical location to function on the network; automatically detecting when a new network device is plugged into the network; automatically determining a physical location of the new network device in the network; and automatically configuring the new network device based on the preconfigured policy settings associated with the physical location of the new network device, wherein associating preconfigured policy settings with physical locations in the

network further comprises displaying a configuration screen that allows the user to create different policy settings that specify what configuration actions are to be taken.

Cochran discloses a device configuration assembly wherein the user may select the desired communication interfaces from the address search option 138 (Page 5, Para. 0042). Applicant asserts that Cochran fails to disclose "...a configuration screen that allows the user to create different policy settings that specify what configuration actions are to be taken." Cochran does not anticipate nor disclose the elements of the claimed invention, nor does Cochran teach, suggest or motivate toward the claimed invention.

An invention is anticipated if it "was . . . described in a printed publication in this . . . country . . . more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States." 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (2000). In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 533 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ("[P]rior art . . . must sufficiently describe the claimed invention to have placed the public in possession of it. Such possession is effected if one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the publication's description of the invention with his own knowledge to make the claimed invention.") (citation omitted). Cochran does not do so in reference to the claimed invention.

As Cochran does not anticipate the claimed invention, nor teach each and every element as disclosed in the claimed invention, Cochran's citations do not anticipate or disclose the recited invention as in Claim 1. As Claims 3-8 depend from Claim 1, Applicant believes such claims are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran et al. (Publication No. U.S. 2002/0161867 A1) in view of Simpson et al. (Publication No. U.S. 2003/0014529 A1).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant submits Cochran and Simpson do not, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest "wherein associating preconfigured policy settings with physical locations in the network further comprises displaying a configuration screen that allows the user to create different policy settings that specify what configuration actions are to be taken" as recited in amended Independent Claim 1.

Examiner has relied on Cochran because “Cochran teaches all the claimed limitations except that he does not explicitly teach the method of detecting and locating the network device by transmitting SNMP queries (11/28/08 Office Action, Page 5).

Examiner has cited that Simpson “teaches the method of detecting and locating the network device by transmitting SNMP queries (11/28/08 Office Action, Page 5). In essence, Simpson discloses a user-driven process that detects and locates network devices by transmitting SNMP queries. There is no teaching or suggestion of a user interface component wherein the user may input various policy settings that specify what configuration actions need be taken – as recited in the claimed invention.

These features in cooperation with the other elements of Claim 1 are not disclosed by either Cochran or Simpson either singly or in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable. Likewise, Claims 3-8 are also allowable first because they depend from allowable base claims and also because they are allowable on their own individual merits.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending Claims 1 and 3-8 as they are newly amended and presented. Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

January 28, 2009

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 30,801

CUSTOMER NUMBER 47052

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549